



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,971	12/27/2000	Sadahiko Kondo	001695	3257
23850	7590	06/18/2004	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ROSE, ROBERT A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	22

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,971

Applicant(s)

KONDO ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Rose

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10 and 12-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-20 is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 21.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3723

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of Applicant's Prior Art Statement, filed May 14, 2004.
2. Claims 1-6, and 11 have been canceled.
3. Claims 7-10, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 7, line 15 the term "plate-like" is deemed vague and indefinite, in that the metes and bounds of this passage are unclear. In claim 10, line 16 the term "plate-like" is deemed vague and indefinite. MPEP 706.03(d).
4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-10, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al in view of Zucker and further in view of Japan No. 11-320231. Honda et al discloses a method of providing a chamfer on upper and lower edges of a workpiece comprising substantially all of the subject matter of claim 7 except for the recitation of the particular value of static friction of the first surface. Zucker discloses a clamping device comprising a pair of clamping surfaces which are made slip-free by coating the surfaces with diamond grit in a metal binder. To provide the clamping surfaces in the method of Honda et al with a coating having a high static friction such as the diamond coating disclosed in Zucker, in order to prevent slippage, would have been obvious in view of Zucker. Japan No. 11-320231 discloses a clamping chuck having plural clamping portions on opposite sides of the rotational axis of the workpiece for

Art Unit: 3723

steadying the workpiece during grinding. To make the work engaging surfaces in the method of Honda et al with spaced portions on opposite sides of the rotational axis to provide minimal contact with the workpiece while keeping the workpiece steady during grinding would have been obvious in view of Japan('231).

6. Claims 16-20 are allowed.

7. Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's new limitation in claims 7 and 10, of the work being "a plate-like segment formed into a shape including a curved line" is deemed to be readable on the workpiece in Honda et al. The wafer in Honda et al is in the form of a plate, and is formed into a shape including a curved line. Applicant's limitation of the center of rotation being between the work contacting portions is deemed to be taught by Japan('231). Such configuration would inherently provide resistance to slippage from forces experienced during grinding. Applicant's independent claims 7, and 10 would define over the art rejections, if the workpiece is recited as being a segment of a ring.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (703) 308-1360.

rr

June 15, 2004.



ROBERT A. ROSE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 323